



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/828,536

04/06/2001

Luca Bolcioni

99-AG-386/GC

4969

23334

7590

05/16/2005

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.

ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER

551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111

BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

LE, VU

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/828,536

Applicant(s)

BOLCIONI ET AL.

Examiner

Vu Le

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-18, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, US 6,421,080 in view of Enright et al, US 6,583,813.**

Re claim 1, Lambert disclose a system for documenting events (fig. 1), said system comprising: a camera for acquiring images and producing a video signal (14);

a memory for storing images based on the video signal (20,22,32), the memory including a first volatile memory (20,32) and a second non-volatile memory (22); a sensor coupled to the memory (34, i.e., trigger event sensor coupled to the memory 20,22,32 via TP 18), wherein the images are stored in the volatile memory, and the sensor activates a transfer of the images from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory (col. 4, lines 7-51).

Lambert discloses associating identifying information with the compressed image data, but fails to specifically disclose *an arithmetic processing unit for certifying each of the images stored in the memory by calculating a digital signature for association with each of the*

Art Unit: 2613

images. Enright discloses (fig. 3: 72, col. 14, line 56-67, see also col. 43, line 51 – col. 44, line 8) an encrypt/authenticate component that runs algorithms for the same purpose as the claimed arithmetic processing unit.

Therefore, the combined teaching of Lambert and Enright would have rendered obvious an arithmetic processing unit for certifying each of the images stored in the memory by calculating a digital signature for association with each of the images as claimed, for the benefit of anti-tampering feature and/or unauthorized use as noted by Enright (col. 14, line 56-67).

Re claim 2, the system as defined in claim 1, wherein when the sensor is activated, images continue to be stored in the volatile memory for a preset time, and then after the preset time all of the images in the volatile memory are transferred from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. (See Lambert, col. 4, line 63 - col. 6, line 29, also figs. 2-4).

Re claim 3, the system as defined in claim 1, further comprising a digital signal processor that compresses the video signal from the camera in order to store the image in the memory in a compressed format. (See Lambert, col. 4, lines 9-17).

Re claim 4, Lambert does not specifically disclose compression in accordance to H.263 as claimed. Instead, Lambert discloses using "suitable" image compression techniques to reduce image data size for temporary storage (col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 6). Official Notice is taken to note that H.263 compression standard is notoriously well known and used in the related art for low bandwidth video data transmission. Hence,

Art Unit: 2613

one skilled in the art would have found it obvious and beneficial to resort to H.263 compression standard for the benefit of low bandwidth video data transmission.

Re claim 6, the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the video signal produced by the camera is a digital signal. (See Lambert, fig. 1, col. 1 lines 54-63, col. 3, line 60-62).

Claims 7 and 11 are method claims corresponding to system claims 1-2, thus they have been analyzed and rejected w/r to claims 1-2 above.

Claim 8 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 3 above. (See also Lambert, col. 5, line 4-8).

Re claim 10, the method as defined in claim 7, further comprising the step of integrating the digital data with relative temporal data. (See Lambert, col. 4, line 2-6).

Claims 12-13 have been analyzed and rejected w/r to claims 1-2 above. Claims 12-13 correspond to claims 1-2 above, however, in the environment of an integrated circuit. It is noted that Lambert discloses a system that is implemented as a personal computer "PC" (col. 3, lines 44-45). A "PC" is essentially an integrated circuit system.

Claim 14 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 3 above.

Claim 15 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 5 above.

Claim 16 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 6 above.

Claims 17 and 21 have been analyzed and rejected w/r to claims 1-2 above. Claims 17 and 21 correspond to claims 1-2 above, however, in the environment of a machine-readable medium. It is noted that Lambert discloses a system that is

implemented as a personal computer "PC" (col. 3, lines 44-45). A "PC" inherently runs a program (i.e. machine-readable medium) to execute functional steps of the system.

Claim 18 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 3 above.

Claim 20 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 10 above.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, US 6,421,080 in view of Enright et al, US 6,583,813 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Rayner, US 6,389,340.

Re claim 5, Lambert in view of Enright discloses a hard drive and/or disk drive as a non-volatile memory (col. 4, line 16-18), but does not specifically disclose the non-volatile memory is a FLASH type memory as claimed. Rayner discloses (fig. 5:56, col. 4, line 59 – col. 5, line 3) a FLASH memory as a permanent digital memory for similar purpose.

Therefore, the combined teaching of Lambert, Enright and Rayner would have rendered it obvious to substitute a hard or disk drive with a FLASH type memory as the non-volatile memory alternative because FLASH memory is notoriously well known for compactness and durability, low voltage operation, and ability to retain data even when power is turned off.

5. Claims 9, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, US 6,421,080 in view of Enright et al, US 6,583,813 as applied to claims 7 and 17 above respectively, and further in view of Krumm, US 5,983,147.

Re claim 9, Lambert in view of Enright fails to disclose the step of *producing an activation signal from an activation sensor of a passenger protection system of an automobile on the occurrence of the external event, wherein the external event is an automobile accident* as now claimed. Krumm discloses (col. 2, line 49-57) activation of an airbag system of a vehicle on the occurrence of a rapid deceleration to avoid a collision i.e. an event only when a person is occupied in the space between the seat and the dashboard.

Therefore, the combined teaching of Lambert, Enright and Krumm as a whole would have rendered obvious *producing an activation signal from an activation sensor of a passenger protection system of an automobile on the occurrence of the external event, wherein the external event is an automobile accident* as claimed for the benefit of providing an enhanced airbag system that only deploys when an occupant is present to save cost of replacement of an airbag (Krumm, col. 1, line 33-49).

Claim 19 corresponds to claim 9 above, however, in the environment of a machine-readable medium. It is noted that Lambert discloses implementation of a personal computer "PC" (col. 3, lines 44-45). A "PC" inherently runs a program (i.e. machine-readable medium) to execute functional steps of the system.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, US 6,421,080 in view of Enright et al, US 6,583,813 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Macky et al, US 6,141,611 and Krumm, US 5,983,147.

Re claim 22, Lambert in view of Enright fails to disclose an auxiliary battery for powering the system if power from the external battery is cut off. Macky discloses (fig. 2: 32, col. 2, line 48-49) a backup battery for such purpose.

Therefore, the combined teaching of Lambert, Enright and Macky would have rendered obvious an auxiliary battery for the purpose of preventing power failure and data loss.

Lambert in view of Enright fails to disclose the sensor is an activation sensor of a passenger protection system of an automobile that is activated in an accident. Krumm discloses (col. 2, line 49-57) activation of an airbag system of a vehicle on the occurrence of a rapid deceleration to avoid a collision only when a person is occupied in the space between the seat and the dashboard.

Therefore, the combined teaching of Lambert, Enright and Krumm as a whole would have rendered obvious the sensor is an activation sensor of a passenger protection system of an automobile that is activated in an accident as claimed for the benefit of providing an enhanced airbag system that only deploys when an occupant is present to save cost of replacement of an airbag (Krumm, col. 1, line 33-49).

7. Amendment to the title is acknowledged and accepted.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vu Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-7332. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. Customer Service can be reached at (571) 272-2600. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-7332.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vu Le
Primary Examiner
AU 2613
(571) 272-7332
Vu.Le@uspto.gov